

ROLE OF RACE AND APPEARANCE IN THE DEHUMANIZATION OF WOMEN AND MINORITIES

A thesis presented to the faculty of the Graduate School of Western Carolina University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in General Psychology

By

Olivia Ateret Muse

Director: Dr. Erin Myers
Assistant Professor of Psychology
Psychology Department

Committee Members: Dr. Thomas E. Ford, Psychology
Dr. Mickey Randolph, Psychology

April, 2016

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge several people who assisted me in the creation and writing of this thesis. First, I would like to thank my thesis director, Dr. Erin Myers, who read countless drafts and provided constant feedback and encouragement. Dr. Myers has been an integral part of this thesis, and its completion would have been impossible without her guidance. Secondly, I would also like to extend thanks to my committee members Dr. Thomas Ford and Dr. Mickey Randolph. Dr. Ford provided advice and feedback that made me a better researcher, and Dr. Randolph always made sure that I didn't take myself too seriously. Thirdly, thanks are extended to Professor David Scales, who also provided essential encouragement and assistance.

Special thanks are also extended to my family, friends, fellow graduate students, and the psychology department, who all helped me reach this point in my academic career.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	iv
Abstract	v
Chapter One: Dehumanization, Women, and Racial Minorities	1
Theoretical Framework of Dehumanization	2
Implicit Social Cognition	5
Sexism and Dehumanization	6
Dehumanization of Women	7
Dehumanization of Minority Women	8
Overview and Predictions	10
Chapter Two: Methods, Results, and Discussion	12
Method	12
Participants and Design	12
Procedure	12
Materials	13
Pre-Tested Images	13
Ambivalent Sexism Inventory	14
Implicit Association Test.....	14
Dehumanization scale.....	16
Demographics	16
Results	16
Ambivalent Sexism Inventory	16
Implicit Association Test.....	17
Dehumanization Scales.....	18
Discussion	20
Limitations.....	22
Directions for Future Research.....	25
Conclusion	27
REFERENCES	29
APPENDICES	39
Pretested Images (Appendix A)	39
Pre-Test Questions (Appendix B)	41
The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Appendix C)	42
Dehumanization Scales (Appendix D).....	44
Demographics (Appendix E).....	45
Tables (Appendix F).....	46

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Pretest Scales Reliability	45
Table 2. Pretest Image Means	46
Table 3. IAT Reliability	47
Table 4. Dehumanization Scales Reliability	48

ABSTRACT

ROLE OF RACE AND APPEARANCE IN THE DEHUMANIZATION OF WOMEN AND MINORITIES

Olivia Ateret Muse

Western Carolina University (April 2016)

Director: Dr. Erin Myers

Research has indicated a pattern in different forms of dehumanization as they occur for women. When women are presented in a beauty-based manner, they are mechanistically dehumanized, which involves a denial of human nature traits; when women are presented with a sex-based connotation they are animalistically dehumanized, which involves a denial of uniquely human traits. However, the literature has widely focused on the manner in which white women are dehumanized, largely ignoring the way in which historical dehumanization based on race may affect the dehumanization of minority women. While it was hypothesized that all female targets would be subject to dehumanization, this study aimed to examine differences in patterns of dehumanization for white, Black, and Asian women. Based on historical stereotypes of Black and Asian women, namely the “Jezebel” and the “Madame Butterfly,” it was hypothesized that Black women will be more animalistically dehumanized in a sex-based context and that Asian women will be more mechanistically dehumanized in a beauty-based context. The results did not fully support the hypotheses. Limitations and future directions for research will be discussed.

CHAPTER ONE: DEHUMANIZATION, WOMEN, AND RACIAL MINORITIES

We all grow up in a culture in which women's bodies are constantly turned into things and objects, here's she's become the bottle of Michelob. In this ad she becomes part of a video game. And this is everywhere... Women's bodies are turned into things and objects... The person is dehumanized and violence becomes inevitable.

(Killing Us Softly, 2010)

Dehumanization has been examined throughout a wide variety of times and events. Most commonly, history remembers dehumanization in times of war, where the enemies of any given nation were presented as subhuman and monstrous as a way to alleviate any misgivings regarding violence committed. This dehumanization occurred in World War II, through the propaganda depicting Japanese people as literal monsters (Weingartner, 1992). This has also been demonstrated in the depiction of Black people as apes, a mental association that still exists and leads to a normalization of racism against individuals of the Black community (Goff, Eberhardt, Williams, & Jackson, 2008). In this way, dehumanization creates a path to violence against an entire race or nation by condoning through “othering” (Salzman, 2012). When basic humanity is denied to individuals or to entire communities, it also denies them moral rights, influencing the way in which they are considered worthy of help or blame (Bastian, Laham, Wilson, Haslam, & Koval, 2011). Yet these examples place dehumanization in the past, when it is still a pervasive aspect of modern society through the dehumanization of minority groups.

Currently, women are particularly vulnerable to dehumanization, given that the sexualization and objectification of women is incredibly pervasive, especially in the Western world (Zurbriggen, Collins, Lamb, Roberts, Tolman, Ward, & Blake, 2007). However, a sizeable

portion of the available literature discusses dehumanization without the consideration of the possible interactions between gender and race, especially in terms of those minorities who have been dehumanized historically.

In this paper, the dehumanization of women will be reviewed and discussed, with a specific focus on two minorities: Black women and Asian women. The nature of the stereotypes regarding Black women and Asian women that propagate dehumanization will be reviewed in full, with an included discussion of how these stereotypes function within the theoretical framework of dehumanization. While all women can be and often are dehumanized, this research aims to discover if minority women are dehumanized to a more extreme degree when compared to Caucasian women. Specifically, Black women may face a more extreme degree of animalistic dehumanization due to the sex-based portrayal of the “Jezebel” stereotype, whereas Asian women may be more likely to face mechanistic dehumanization as a result of the beauty-based portrayal of the “Madame Butterfly” stereotype. The subsequent study may aid in providing a more detailed definition of dehumanization based on the preexisting theoretical framework and augmenting the already present literature.

Theoretical Framework of Dehumanization

Examining dehumanization from a theoretical perspective has revealed two different subtypes of dehumanization in regards to women: mechanistic and animalistic (Haslam, Bain, Douge, Lee, & Bastian, 2005). Mechanistic dehumanization refers to the dehumanization of an individual by relating them to an object, while animalistic dehumanization refers to the dehumanization of an individual by relating them to an animal (Rudman, & Mescher, 2012). Haslam et al. (2005) created a framework for understanding how these two types of objectification function. People are generally attributed with human nature traits that are

considered central to humanity: emotional responsiveness, interpersonal warmth, cognitive openness, individuality, and depth. In mechanistic dehumanization, a denial of these central human aspects induces a view of the target that attributes them with object traits such as inertness, coldness, rigidity, passivity, and superficiality (Haslam, 2006). However, more criteria have been added to the framework of mechanistic dehumanization by other researchers. An additional abjuration of warmth and competence is associated with objectification, which promotes an overall negative affect towards the denied target across many cultures (Fiske, Cuddy, & Glick, 2007). In this way, mechanistic dehumanization occurs when the individual's physical attributes are inherently separated from their mind and value is attached to their body (Gervais, Holland, & Dodd, 2013). As such, an individual who has been mechanistically dehumanized is seen as an automaton, in partiality by the perceiver acting to self-humanize as compared to the target (Loughnan & Haslam, 2007).

This theoretical framework has also outlined many of the detrimental effects of this form of dehumanization. When an individual is attributed with human nature traits, they are seen as possessing a soul and as worth protecting (Gray, Gray, & Wegner, 2007). However, when individuals are not viewed as possessing human nature traits, they are viewed with less empathy and seen as less human, with a relation to objects (Fiske, 2009; Brennan, 2005). As individuals are objectified, they are perceived as possessing less of an independent mind and with less morality (Loughnan, Haslam, Murnane, Vaes, Reynolds, & Suitner, 2010). This dehumanization leads to a maltreatment of the individual, where said mistreatment constructs an environment where the target possesses devalued status and identity (Bastian, & Haslam, 2011).

Haslam's framework also presents the uniquely human traits of civility, refinement, morality, logic, and maturity, traits that are meant to differentiate people from animals. A denial

of these uniquely human traits forces the target to be seen as uncultured, coarse, amoral, instinct-driven, and childlike, which relates the target to an animal and thus, animalistic dehumanization occurs (2006). In addition, the target is also viewed as lacking any form of advanced intelligence, as well as any refined emotional abilities (Haslam, Kashima, Loughnan, Shi, & Suitner, 2008; Brennan, 2005). When denied these traits, targets are debased, and become categorized as lower life forms (Bastian, & Haslam, 2011). Through this debasement, there is a reduction of moral status that is very similar to the way in which mindless animals are often perceived (Waytz, Gray, Epley, & Wegner, 2010). Given that this dehumanization of person to animal causes the individual to be viewed in a negative sense, the perceiver often “others” the target as a way to distance themselves from those feelings of negativity (Waytz, et al., 2010). This is also described as *infrahumanization*, in which a perceiver accords a target that they feel is dissimilar or lesser than themselves with fewer uniquely human traits in order to create a “comfortable” distance between the self and other (Loughnan & Haslam, 2007).

This distance between perceiver and perceived has the possibility of generating intense consequences for the dehumanized target. People who have been depicted with a similarity to animals trigger a disgust response in the individual perceiving them (Sherman & Haidt, 2011). This harkens back to the historical dehumanization of African-American and Asian people, in which both groups were displayed in grotesque ways in order to dehumanize them (Goff, et al., 2008; Weingartner, 1992). In this historical context and in the present, animalistic dehumanization increases aggression and harassment towards the dehumanized individual on the micro level (Rudman & Mescher, 2012) and genocide on the macro level (Salzman, 2012). In a study completed by Fiske, results indicated that individuals could be lead to dehumanize a target

that is portrayed in a “subhuman” way, even when the perceiver originally held no prejudice against the target (2009).

Implicit Social Cognition

Dehumanization most commonly occurs on the fringes of consciousness, given that most prejudice forms unconsciously due to the knowledge of stereotypes concerning specific minority groups (Goff et al., 2008). Due to this, it is important to discuss the role of implicit social cognition as it works within dehumanization. Implicit social cognition describes the way which humans’ remembrance of a past event may unconsciously affect any number of current mental processes (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995); this often allows for more streamlined cognitive processes as it commonly involves categorical representations (Macrae & Bodenhausen, 2001). This is beneficial to research regarding and form of prejudice, given that individuals may explicitly indicate one social attitude, but implicitly carry social attitudes of which they are not consciously aware (Wilson, Lindsey, & Schooler, 2000).

In line with the current research, it is also imperative to discuss differences between explicit and implicit prejudice. Explicit prejudice seems to describe a bias where an individual acts in a deliberately prejudice way towards a target, whereas implicit prejudice describes actions or attitudes of which an individual is not completely cognizant (Dovidio, Kawakami, & Gaertner, 2002). Given that dehumanization seems to most commonly occur in an implicit sense (Haslam, 2006; Loughnan, & Haslam, 2007) this indicates that implicit measures would be most beneficial in assessing dehumanizing attitudes. Implicit measures such as the Implicit Association Test (IAT; Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998) provide an insight into an individual’s mind that self-report cannot always supply, allowing an inference of mental content that is not affected by social norms (Nosek, Hawkins, & Frazier, 2011). The IAT has been beneficial in regards to

studying implicit social cognition as it allows for the detection of minute differences on a number of implicit attitudes, such as in-group preferences (Fazio & Olson, 2003). These processes seem to appear most strongly when an individual is exposed to stereotypical stimuli, as opposed to when the stimuli are non-stereotypical representations of the outgroup (Blair, Ma, & Lenton, 2001).

Sexism and Dehumanization

While society as a whole has progressed to some extent, sexism still stands as a common occurrence in the everyday experiences of women (Swim, Hyers, Cohen, & Ferguson, 2001) and these cultural attitudes of sexism are also highly related to both objectification theory and dehumanization. Objectification theory posits that women suffer from sexual objectification, but also assert that women are negatively affected by other forms of gender-based discrimination, such as employment discrimination and sexual violence (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997; Moradi & Huang, 2008); sexism creates a milieu where this type of discrimination is commonplace, and more readily leads to the objectification of women, by themselves and by others (Swim, et al., 2001). This sexist atmosphere leads to an “othering” of women through the creation of inequality between men and women based on conventional gender roles (Glick & Fiske, 2001). Based on the creation of inequality, this sexist environment essentially functions as a stepping stone for dehumanization, as sexism normalizes this treatment (Rudman & Mescher, 2012). This link is exacerbated in the way in which dehumanization functions: a minority is categorized as an “outgroup” and this leads to the discrimination and dehumanization of the group by a denial of human nature and uniquely human traits (Haslam, 2006).

This dehumanization must also be discussed in terms of the way it relates to different types of sexism. Two types of sexism are most commonly used to describe these attitudes:

benevolent sexism describes attitudes that “revere” women, but ultimately enforce their subordination; hostile sexism describes attitudes that justify women’s subordination through male dominance (Glick, et al., 2000). This research stems directly from the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996) which is utilized to assess these attitudes of benevolent and hostile sexism. Also following from this line of research, Cikara, Eberhardt, and Fiske (2011) found that men specifically were more likely to mechanistically dehumanize women when the men in question achieved high hostile sexism scores; hostile sexism also had a negative correlation with mental state attribution when the men viewed portraits of overtly sexualized females.

Dehumanization of Women

Understanding the theoretical background of mechanistic dehumanization allows for a more precise understanding of the way in which it occurs for women. In Western culture, a prominence is placed on the physical appearances of women and girls, where women are subsequently judged on this physical emphasis and sexualized because of this emphasis (Zurbriggen, et al., 2007). This can obviously be observed in media advertisements, where at least half of all advertisements containing women portray these women as decorative sex objects in a way that is specifically directed at men (Stankiewicz & Rosselli, 2008). As was also mentioned previously, this emphasis on physical appearances reduces women solely to their bodies in a way that presents women as objects for sexual use and pleasure (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). This is particularly pervasive in the pornographic film industry, in which women’s subsequent presentation acts to narrow them down solely into the way in which they can be used (Hernandez, 2011; Dworkin, 1994) This is not limited to pornography, as this is even present in the cases of female politicians such as Sarah Palin, who are presented with a

focus on their appearance; this focus ultimately downgrades perceptions of the female politician as competent and respectable (Heflick & Goldenberg, 2009).

Essentially, this demonstrates that mechanistic dehumanization occurs for women when they are depicted with an emphasis on their physical attractiveness, in a way that distances them from their human nature traits. In a study conducted by Mulac, Jansma, and Linz (2002), male participants were exposed to film that was both sexual and degrading towards women; in later interactions with female partners, these men made more sexual advances and more often interrupted or spoke over their partners. This holds with other research that indicates that when women feel objectified, they act to narrow their social presence by talking less in the face of the male gaze (Saguy, Quinn, Dovidio, & Pratto, 2010).

Instead of through a beauty-based focus, animalistic dehumanization most often follows from a focus on the sex appeal of women. Women who are portrayed in a sexual manner are broken down into a portrayal of being less human, which leads perceivers to relate said women to animalistic concepts (Vaes, Paladino, & Puvia, 2011). Similar to women who have been mechanistically dehumanized, female targets likened to animals are seen as less competent through a denial of their uniquely human traits; these targets are not seen as capable of higher intelligence (Graff, Murnen, & Smolak, 2012).

Dehumanization of Minority Women

Women of racial minorities face a particularly specialized form of dehumanization that is determined through the interaction of their race and alleged sexuality. In many media representations of Black women, Black women are portrayed as the “Jezebel,” an over sexualized stereotype that invites sexual assault (Brooks, & Hébert, 2006; Mayo, 2010). The Jezebel imagery is accentuated with animal traits, which highlight a primitive eroticism (Railton,

& Watson, 2005). This stereotype can be traced back in part to the “Hottentot Venus,” properly known as Sarah “Saartjie” Baartman. Baartman, a member of a Khoikhoi tribe, was taken from her home and made to display her nude body to European crowds, an act that both hypersexualized and made animalistic her natural anatomy (Hobson, 2003). Building from this pervasive depiction, the Jezebel stereotype objectifies Black women through animalistic dehumanization, presenting their bodies as sexually available and promiscuous in a way that negates their uniquely human traits (Pilgrim, 2002). Furthermore, this is promoted by the presentation that the Jezebel is fulfilling her own sexually animalistic and amoral needs, placing all of responsibility for subsequent interactions and consequences on Black women (Stephens & Phillips, 2003). This creates a dangerous atmosphere for Black women, one in which they cannot separate race and gender and more often suffer for it through racialized sexual assault, with these crimes focusing on the assumption that Black women are more sexually promiscuous than white women (Buchanan, & Ormerod, 2002).

The stereotype that exists as a form of dehumanization for Asian women is known as the “Madame Butterfly Effect.” The term itself and part of the objectification can be traced back to such works as Pierre Loti’s *Madame Chrysanthème*, John Luther Long’s “Madame Butterfly,” and Giacomo Puccini’s *Madama Butterfly*, stories that revolved around American men marrying Japanese geisha (Groos, 1991). This stereotype was continued through America’s Postwar Era, in which Japanese and other Asian women were separated from their male counterparts by being categorized as subservient and hyper-feminine (Mura, 2005). This label of the “Madame Butterfly” has not disappeared over time, but is actually still prevalent in media representations of Asian women (Brooks, & Hébert, 2006).

Asian-American author Patricia Park describes her own experiences and the history surrounding them. Park states that she has often found herself on the receiving end of sexual advances merely on the basis of her Asian heritage, an occurrence that she attributes to portrayals of Asian women as decorative objects, in many ways similar to dolls (Park, 2014). This personal anecdote allows for a greater understanding of the way in which mechanistic dehumanization may function through the Madame Butterfly stereotype. The racialized sexualization of Asian women focuses on their submission to men, in that they are viewed as passive objects with the sole purpose of pleasing men (Sue, Bucceri, Lin, Nadal, & Torino, 2009). This passivity is also emphasized through the depicted traits of being reticent and demure, traits that eventually lead to mechanistic objectification (Lee & Vaught, 2003). Asian women are mechanistically dehumanized through this orientalization, a point of view that places emphasis on the control of Asian women as if they were decorative objects to be handled, a perspective that paints them as less than human (Uchida, 1998).

Overview and Predictions

Due to this aforementioned lack of scrutiny, this study aims to examine the nature of both mechanistic and animalistic dehumanization in regards to different targets. The present research examined the effects of race, gender, and appearance of multiple targets on the tendency of others to perceive these targets as animals or objects. It is hypothesized that: a) women are mechanistically or animalistically dehumanized when they are viewed in a beauty-based or sex-based context, respectively; b) Black women in a sex-based context are animalistically dehumanized to a more extreme degree as understood by the Jezebel stereotype, which presents them as animalistic and promiscuous; c) Asian women in a beauty-based context are mechanistically dehumanized to a more extreme degree as understood by the Madame Butterfly

stereotype, which presents them as doll-like and subservient; d) insofar as participants hold hostile sexist beliefs, all women will be dehumanized to a greater extent.

CHAPTER TWO: METHODS, RESULTS, AND DISCUSSION

Method

Participants and Design

Research indicates that the gender of the perceiver does not affect animalistic dehumanization; however, gender of the perceiver does affect mechanistic dehumanization, in that women are less likely than men to dehumanize other women in this way (Vaes, et al., 2011). Therefore, males and females were included in this study. Participants were 39 female and 10 male students from undergraduate psychology courses at a Southeastern mid-size comprehensive university ($N=49$). The ages of participants ranged from 18 to 29 ($M=20.73$; $SD=2.58$). Participants were predominantly White ($n=39$), though 20.4% of participants were African-American, Hispanic, or identified as other ($n=10$). Participants were predominantly heterosexual ($n=45$), while the remaining participants identified as bisexual or gay ($n=4$). Participants were exposed to all conditions in 3 (race: White, Black, Asian) x 3 (appearance: sex-based, beauty-based, neutral) repeated-measures design. Gender was utilized as a between-subjects grouping variable.

Procedure

A preliminary study was first conducted in order to pretest all images that were utilized in the primary experiment. As research indicates that these forms of dehumanization do not carry the same effect for male targets (Bernard, Gervais, Allen, Campomizzi, & Klein, 2012), all targets in the pretested images were female. There were 27 images of women sorted by race and appearance (white, Black, & Asian; sex-based, beauty-based, & neutral). Participants were asked

to rate each target female on perceived attractiveness, sexuality, and approachability, as well as the extent to which she was valued for each aforementioned trait.

In the primary experiment, participants were first administered the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996) in order to assess the degree to which they hold hostile or benevolent sexist beliefs. Participants then took six customized versions of the IAT utilizing the aforementioned pretested images, as well as the human nature and uniquely human traits that Haslam presented in his research to assess the human qualities possessed by each target (Haslam et al., 2005). Participants also completed a short survey of demographics. This concluded the first session, which took approximately 30 minutes for each participant to complete. After one week participants returned to the lab to complete the second session. During this session, participants completed an explicit form of the dehumanization scales (Haslam, et al., 2005), where participants viewed each of the target pictures and rated each woman on a series of human nature and uniquely human traits presented as a Likert scale. This session was also approximately 30 minutes in length.

Materials

Pre-Tested Images. A total of 27 images were selected and pretested (see Appendix A) for use in this study. Each target image was selected carefully, in order to ensure that all of the photos were similar in appearance, arrangement, and quality. Additionally, each image was edited to have the same background and size. There were a total of nine images grouped by race for each target female, with each group of nine images split into categorizations of sex-based, beauty-based, and neutral. Cronbach's alpha was calculated for each administered scale based on target image type (see table 1 for Cronbach's α coefficients). The nine sex-based targets were all rated as being both attractive and sexual, as well as valued for these traits. However, they were

not perceived as personable or valued for their personhood. Among the nine beauty-based images, the targets were perceived as attractive and were valued for that attractiveness, but were seen as less sexual and less personable. The nine neutral targets were seen as attractive, but value was not assigned to them based on that attractiveness. They were also perceived as being less sexual and less valued for that sexuality, but were seen as both personable and being valued for their personhood (see table 2 for mean image ratings).

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory. The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996) is a 22-item measure created to assess attitudes of benevolent and hostile sexism towards women. The ASI assesses these attitudes by presenting a series of 22 statements to which participants can indicate the degree to which they agree or disagree. For example, participants are presented statements such as “[n]o matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman” and “[m]any women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for ‘equality.’” Past research has demonstrated that the reliability of the ASI reaches acceptable levels with reliability coefficients ranging from .73 to .91 across samples (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick & Fiske, 1997; Glick & Fiske, 2011). The ASI has acceptable convergent and discriminant validity, which has been demonstrated in clear factor loadings through exploratory factor analysis; the ASI also has predictive validity (Thorndike, 1918) which has been displayed through correlations with explicit measures of sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick & Fiske, 1997; Glick & Fiske, 2011). For the present study, the ASI reached acceptable levels of reliability ($\alpha=.90$).

Implicit Association Test. The Implicit Association Test (IAT; Greenwald, et al., 1998) is a widely used measure of implicit social cognition. The IAT assesses implicit attitudes through

a computerized system that involves sorting terms or pictures in categories; delay or acceleration in these sorting tasks can reveal biases of which participants may not be explicitly aware. In regards to this study, open-source software, *FreeIAT*, developed by Adam Meade (2009) and the aforementioned framework of dehumanization (Haslam, et al., 2005) were used to develop the test specifically to this topic. A total of six versions of the IAT were created in order to compare all relevant targets. All six IATs used images with white females, to which all other non-White targets were compared (e.g., sex-based white target compared to sex-based Black target, beauty-based white target compared to beauty-based Asian target, neutral white target compared to neutral Black target).

Following Haslam's (2005) framework, participants were asked to sort a series of human nature words (friendly, fun-loving, uncooperative, unemotional) and uniquely human words (ambitious, imaginative, high-strung, disorganized) into categories of positive or negative. Participants also classified images of female targets (Black, white, Asian; sex-based, beauty-based, neutral) into the categories of positive or negative. The IAT score reflects implicit attitudes of dehumanization that the participants may attribute to the female targets.

Past research has demonstrated that the reliability of the IAT reaches acceptable levels, with levels of test-retest reliability ranging from .60 to .82. (Banse, Seise, & Zerbis, 2001; Cunningham, Preacher, & Banaji, 2001; Greenwald, Banaji, Rudman, Farnham, Nosek, & Mellott, 2002). The IAT has also been shown to have acceptable convergent and discriminant validity, and thus a large degree of construct validity (Cureton, 1951), through high correlations with explicit measures examining the same construct, no correlations with similar measures predicting different target categories, and through confirmatory factor analysis (Banse, et al., 2001; Cunningham, et al., 2001; Gawronski, 2002). However, for the current study, none of the

developed IATs reached acceptable levels of reliability (see table 3 for reliability coefficients). The implications of low internal reliability will be discussed in the limitations.

Dehumanization scale. While research does indicate that dehumanization occurs on an implicit level (Goff et al., 2008), this study may benefit by also examining dehumanization in a more explicit context. In order to gain an explicit measure of dehumanizing attitudes towards the photographed target women, a Likert scale (Likert, 1932) was created by utilizing a list of 16 descriptive terms generated by Haslam et al. (2005). These traits were chosen from a list of Five Factor Model descriptors (McCrae & Costa, 1985), and were rated on whether they were uniquely human or human nature related. With these terms, participants were asked to rate each target female on eight human nature traits (e.g., active, curious, unemotional, uncooperative) and eight uniquely human traits (e.g., ambitious, analytic, impatient, impulsive). This scale was designed as a 5-point Likert scale, with ratings labeled from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” Cronbach’s alpha was calculated for each administered scale based on target image type (see table 4 for Cronbach’s α coefficients). All of the calculated Cronbach’s α coefficients reached .70 or higher.

Demographics. Participants answered four demographics questions at the conclusion of the survey. Each participant was asked to report their age, gender, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation.

Results

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory

Scores on the two ASI subscales (Benevolent and Hostile) were analyzed in order to determine the degree to which participants hold hostile and/or benevolent sexist beliefs. The ASI, specifically the hostile sexism subscale, was used as a covariate in the present data analysis, as

research indicates that individuals high in hostile sexist beliefs dehumanize women to a more extreme degree (Cikara, et al., 2011). Relevant items were reverse-coded and mean scores were calculated for each participant on both subscales. Congruent with the findings of Glick and Fiske (1996), there was a significant correlation between Hostile and Benevolent sexism scores ($r=.32$, $p<.05$). This follows from previous research indicating that Hostile and Benevolent sexism are related, but separate forms of sexist attitudes.

Implicit Association Test

IAT scores were analyzed by each participant's overall score and their section score based on response time (Greenwald, et al., 2003; Meade, 2009) on each individual IAT. Scores were calculated by differencing the response times in stages five and three, and dividing these differences by the pooled standard deviation (Greenwald, Nosek, & Banaji, 2003). A positive score on the IAT indicates an association between the first pairing of traits. Therefore, this indicates a stronger association between the White target and humanizing traits, and the minority target and the dehumanizing traits. Conversely, a negative score indicates an association between the second pairing of traits. This indicates a stronger association between the White target and dehumanizing traits, and the minority target and humanizing traits.

Three MANOVAs were run in order to compare mean IAT responses. Based on the hypothesis, the first MANOVA compared the beauty-based White-Black comparison and the sex-based White-Black comparison. There was no significant difference between the mean response scores on these IATs ($F(1,48)=.05$, $p=.827$). As such, the beauty-based portrayal ($M=.09$, $SD=.64$) and sex-based portrayal ($M=.06$, $SD=.69$) did not affect the extent to which the Black target was dehumanized in relation to the white target. The mean responses of the beauty-based White-Asian comparison and the sex-based White-Asian comparison were also evaluated.

There was a significant difference between these two IATs ($F(1,48)=4.56, p<.038$). The Asian target in the sex-based portrayal was dehumanized more ($M=.32, SD=.84$) than the Asian target in the beauty-based portrayal ($M=.02, SD=.72$). Given the difference in means, a third MANOVA was conducted in order to compare the sex-based White-Black IAT and the sex-based White-Asian IAT. There was not a significant difference in the mean responses between these two IATs, though the difference did trend towards significance ($F(1,48)=2.65, p=.11$).

Based on the differences between these comparisons, it seemed likely that Asian targets may have been dehumanized more than the other groups. Therefore, composite scores for the Black and Asian targets were created by averaging mean IAT responses on the sex-based and beauty-based comparisons. A MANOVA was used to analyze these composite mean responses. However, there was not a significant difference between the Asian and Black target across sex-based and beauty-based portrayals ($F(1,48)=.93, p=.34$). As such, the Asian target ($M=.17, SD=.59$) was not dehumanized to a greater extent than the Black target ($M=.07, SD=.47$). However, these results must be interpreted loosely. While limitations of this study will be addressed in the discussion, the low reliability of the IATs may have affected these results adversely and thus call into question whether or not they speak to actual differences among the different comparisons.

Dehumanization Scales

Scores on the two dehumanization scales subscales (animalistic and mechanistic) were analyzed in order to determine the degree to which the relevant targets were dehumanized. All negatively worded items were reverse-coded. Mean scores on both subscales were calculated based on image type and model race (i.e., the means for the three white beauty-based images

were averaged into a single composite score). In regards to scores on these scales, a lower score indicated that the target was dehumanized to a more extreme degree.

Six repeated-measures MANOVAs were run in order to analyze and compare scores on each of dehumanization subscales. There was a main effect of race on the three beauty-based targets on the animalistic dehumanization subscale ($F(2,92)=14.92, p<.000$) and the mechanistic dehumanization subscale ($F(2,92)=10.02, p<.000$). On the animalistic subscale, white women had the lowest score ($M=3.36, SD=.39$), and Black ($M=3.61, SD=.29$) and Asian ($M=3.51, SD=.31$) targets did not significantly differ. Black women in the beauty-based context were the most humanized on the mechanistic subscale ($M=3.59, SD=.35$). White ($M=3.40, SD=.37$) and Asian targets ($M=3.49, SD=.35$) did not significantly differ on mechanistic dehumanization, although the difference did approach significance ($p=.059$).

The main effect of race approached significance for the three neutral targets on the animalistic dehumanization subscale ($F(2,92)=2.92, p=.059$). Asian targets received the highest score on the animalistic subscale ($M=3.71, SD=.37$). White targets ($M=3.60, SD=.42$) and Black targets ($M=3.62, SD=.36$) did not differ significantly on this subscale. There was no main effect of race between the three neutral targets on the mechanistic dehumanization subscale ($F(2,92)=0.78, p=0.463$).

There was a main effect of race for the targets in the sex-based context when rated on the animalistic dehumanization subscale ($F(2,92)=5.72, p=.005$). White women received the lowest dehumanization score on the animalistic subscale ($M=3.34, SD=.45$). There was no significant difference between the Black ($M=3.49, SD=.37$) and Asian ($M=3.45, SD=.36$) sex-based targets on the animalistic subscale. There was no main effect on the mechanistic dehumanization subscale and the targets did not significantly differ ($F(2,92)=1.63, p=.202$).

Discussion

The results of this experiment attempted to contribute to the existing literature regarding the dehumanization of women. Previous literature has indicated that women face specific forms of dehumanization in sex-based and beauty-based contexts: animalistic and mechanistic, respectively (Haslam, et al., 2005; Haslam, et al., 2008; Rudman & Mescher, 2012). However, this literature has often ignored dehumanizing stereotypes associated with minority women, particularly Black and Asian women. The present research endeavored to extend the current knowledge of dehumanization by including minority women in the theoretical framework of animalistic and mechanistic dehumanization. The Jezebel (Brooks & Hébert, 2006; Mayo, 2010) and Madame Butterfly (Mura, 2005; Brooks & Hébert, 2006) stereotypes of these minority women are both dehumanizing in nature, and this study aimed to determine if these stereotypes exacerbated dehumanization faced by Black and Asian women.

The first hypothesis purported that women are mechanistically or animalistically dehumanized when they are viewed in a beauty-based or sex-based context, respectively. This hypothesis was somewhat supported by results on the IAT. The Asian targets were dehumanized more on the sex-based IAT, which may indicate that dehumanization occurs in specific situations. Again, these results must be interpreted loosely based on the poor reliabilities of the IATs. Additionally, this hypothesis was only partially supported by the results on the dehumanization scales. The three female targets (white, Black, and Asian) were perceived differently based on the context in which they were presented on the dehumanization scales. However, the results did not follow the predictions made based on the theoretical framework: at least one female target was dehumanized in every context, even when presented neutrally. Following from previous

literature, dehumanization should have only occurred in the beauty- and sex-based presentations; no differences should have occurred in the neutral context.

The second and third hypotheses purported that Black women in a sex-based context would be animalistically dehumanized to a more extreme degree and that Asian women in a beauty-based context would be mechanistically dehumanized to a more extreme degree, particularly when compared to the white female target. These hypotheses were not supported by results on the IAT. First, the comparison of the Black targets on the sex-based and beauty-based IAT revealed no significant differences; according to the hypothesis regarding the Jezebel stereotype, the Black target should have been dehumanized more in the sex-based context. The analysis of the Asian target's sex-based and beauty-based comparisons also did not support the hypotheses. The third hypothesis purported that Asian women would be more dehumanized in the beauty-based comparison due to the Madame Butterfly stereotype; however, the Asian target was the most dehumanized in the sex-based comparison.

Results on the dehumanization scales also did not support the hypotheses. In regards to animalistic dehumanization in a sex-based context, the white targets received the lowest mean dehumanization score, whereas Black and Asian women did not significantly differ. None of these targets differed on the mechanistic dehumanization subscale, which followed from previous research regarding the dehumanization of women. In regards to mechanistic dehumanization in a beauty-based context, Asian and White women were dehumanized the most. However, the white targets' mean dehumanization scores trended towards being significantly lower than that of the Asian target. These targets also differed on the animalistic dehumanization subscale, where white women were dehumanized to a more extreme degree than the Black and Asian women. This does not derive from previous research regarding the dehumanization of

women in beauty-based and sex-based contexts, as the beauty-based portrayal should not have engendered animalistic dehumanization. Therefore, these results provide, at best, a cursory support of the second and third hypotheses.

The fourth hypothesis dealt with hostile sexism, in that dehumanization would be exacerbated insofar as participants held hostile sexist beliefs. While previous research has used scores on the hostile sexism subscale of the ASI in relation to dehumanization (Cikara, et al., 2011), the inclusion of the subscale as a covariate did not significantly affect the results of the study. This may be due in part to the lack of male participants in the study ($n=10$), as we may tend to observe more men who hold hostile sexist beliefs, especially as compared to women (Glick & Fiske, 1996). However, it seems likely that these results could have been negatively impacted by the number of limitations associated with this study.

Limitations

The present research was limited in several ways, regarding both study design and theoretical framework. First, the present sample collected from this study was not sufficiently diverse for the intended analysis. In the original study design, gender was intended for use as a between-subjects variable, as previous research has indicated that gender of the perceiver does affect mechanistic dehumanization, in that women are less likely than men to dehumanize other women (Vaes, et al., 2011). However, due to the unbalanced sample between female ($n=39$) and male ($n=10$) participants, the use of gender as a between-subjects variable was not feasible. As such, the results of the study were likely negatively impacted by this lack of viable comparison. For any further research, a balance of gender among subjects should allow for a more comprehensive understanding of the way in which men and women tend to dehumanize female targets.

Additionally, the design of this study might have affected the way in which participants perceived the target images, and thus their subsequent responses to and ratings of those images. While a within-subjects design is beneficial in reducing error variance and allows a more precise measurement of differences between conditions, completion of the study may have been confusing and fatiguing for many participants. The entirety of the study was conducted over two thirty minute sessions, where the IATs were administered in the first session. Many of the participants indicated an initial confusion over the completion of each IAT, which affected the way in which they reacted. Therefore, it is likely that a neutral practice IAT would have allowed for a smoother completion of the first session. In the second session, participants were asked to rate twenty-seven images on the sixteen-item dehumanization scales. This created a total of 432 ratings across the target images in the second session. The possible fatigue experienced by the participants may have affected their perceptions of the different targets, and thus a between-subjects design may have alleviated this possible issue.

In regards to measures utilized, the ASI and dehumanization scales were both reliable measures; the pretest scales were also fairly reliable. However, the use of the IAT as the predominant measure in this study may have adversely affected data collection. The minimal acceptable reliability coefficient is 0.7, a necessary qualification for assessing internal consistency and measure error. As is common with other IAT scoring methods (Greenwald, Nosek, & Banaji, 2003), split-half reliability was the technique implemented for determining the reliability of the IAT. The reliability coefficients calculated for the current set of IATs did not reach acceptable levels by any means, and as such the created tests do not efficiently measure the constructs of interest. This may be due to a number of reasons. First, the program that was utilized (FreeIAT; Meade, 2009) may have been susceptible to technical difficulties.

Correspondence with the creator of the program indicated that technical issues may have occurred for one of the six IATs (White-Black; beauty-based) as the scoring method produced negative reliability. Given that the reliability coefficients were calculated using split-half reliability, it is unlikely that the coefficients would have been negative unless there were only two trials (images and/or words) per block. However, this does not account for the other IAT reliability coefficients, which, while not negative, did not reach .70. While the recommended number of trials per block were used, each individual IAT may have benefitted from more trials per block in order to increase the overall reliability of the measure. It is also possible that the stereotypes used for each target group were not sufficiently associated with the relevant group, and thus did not engender a strong enough effect on the timed IAT responses (as is discussed in future directions for research).

Nevertheless, it is also significant to consider differing opinions regarding the reliability and validity of the IAT. While a portion of research involving the IAT has named it as a reliable and valid measurement (Banse, et al., 2001; Cunningham, et al., 2001; Greenwald, et al., 2002), other research has debated its qualifications. The psychometric utility of the IAT as a method for analyzing implicit attitudes has been called into question, particularly in terms of the measurement of two distinct variables that combine in such a way to jointly affect the construct of interest; the justification for the way in which total scores are then calculated and interpreted has also been questioned (Blanton, Jaccard, Gonzales, & Christie, 2005; Blanton, Jaccard, Christie, & Gonzales, 2007). The implicit nature of the IAT has also been debated, as it may be that the test is vulnerable to strategic test taking in order to achieve specific results (Fiedler, Messner, & Bluemke, 2006). While other researchers have implemented the IAT with little to no

difficulty, the current study may have benefitted from other established measures that have not been quite so contentious in the psychological world.

Additionally, hypothesis incongruent results on the explicit dehumanization scales may be due in part to the suppression of racial prejudice. White women consistently received the lowest dehumanization scores (indicating that they were more dehumanized), whereas Black and Asian women received higher, more humanized scores. As attitudes towards racial prejudice have fluctuated over time and racial minorities are now often protected by egalitarian societal norms, people now tend to suppress any prejudice so as not to face social sanctions (Crandall, Ferguson, & Bahns, 2013). As such, this suppression of racial prejudice may have impacted the way in which participants responded on the explicit dehumanization scales: they may have humanized the minority targets more so as not to appear prejudiced. These patterns of aversive racism (explicit egalitarian views and implicit racial prejudice) may have been more evidently displayed had the IAT proven to be a reliable measure of implicit attitudes in this context.

Directions for Future Research

While the current study faced a number of limitations and null results, applicable changes to the study and the integration of other theories may create directions of future research within the framework of dehumanization. An exploration of the relevant stereotypes for each of the target groups in this study may create a more solid base for the understanding of dehumanization for women and minorities. As was stated earlier, the majority of research that has focused on the dehumanization of women has used solely white targets. Due to this, it could be that the framework of dehumanizing labels that applies to white targets may not necessarily generalize to minority women. Following the work of Devine (1989), having participants list the stereotypes commonly associated with each target group (regardless of beliefs) would assist in building a

more comprehensive understanding of dehumanizing stereotypes. As such, building the theoretical framework in this manner would likely allow for a more distinct measuring of the associated stereotypes.

Moreover, previous research regarding the classification of social groups into specific categories has benefitted from the use of priming. A priming of social category labels often engenders a stronger activation of the stereotypes associated with that label, leading to a more distinct measurement of the stereotype in question (Devine, 1989; Lepore & Brown, 1997). In regards to the study of mechanistic or animalistic dehumanization, activation of the stereotypes associated with these forms of dehumanization may be strengthened by preconscious exposure to the labels of “animal” or “object.” Even exposing participants to images of animals or objects may be beneficial in the triggering and examination of the relevant associations.

Moreover, building further research based upon the Stereotype Content Model (SCM; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002) could potentially benefit the current line of research. This model presents unique dimensions that individuals can be catalogued into based on perceptions of warmth and competence associated with that individual’s group status. Groups that are sorted into the lowest dimension (low competence; low warmth) are dehumanized and perceived as being unable to experience the complexity of humanity (Harris & Fiske, 2006). However, the current study’s groups of interest, particularly Asian and Black women, may be relegated to different quadrants based on the possible forms of dehumanization that are applied. As they may be sorted into different quadrants (low warmth-high competence; high warmth-low competence), different measures specifically assessing the warmth and competence of these targets may be more suited to the research questions. As such, a more distinct understanding of both mechanistic

and animalistic dehumanization through the SCM would lend itself to any future research conducted on dehumanization.

Objectification theory must also be taken into account when considering these forms of dehumanization. Objectification theory is a theoretical framework that postulates that women are socialized to internalize an outsider's perspective of themselves, a perspective that sexualizes women's physical selves (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Sexual objectification, like dehumanization, occurs when women are reduced to a less than human status by focusing on their attractiveness or their body (Moradi & Huang, 2008). When consistently exposed to sexual objectification through the male gaze, women are thus socialized to view themselves as sexual objects through experiences that force women to focus on their own appearance (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Through this forced self-objectification, women report feeling significantly more body shame and social physique anxiety when exposed to the male gaze, as opposed to women who are subject to the gaze of a fellow female (Calogero, 2004). While objectification theory may lend more information to the aftermath of dehumanization, it may also engender better understanding of the process of dehumanization.

Conclusion

The present research reveals important findings in that women of different racial backgrounds are dehumanized differently dependent on their portrayal (sex- or beauty-based). However, the results did not support the original hypotheses, which may be due largely in part to the limitations associated with the current study. The current questions would likely benefit from an amalgamation of different theories and methodologies that have examined similar psychological constructs. As such, further examination and research regarding the

dehumanization of women, particularly minority women, may grant a more comprehensive understanding of the nature of dehumanization.

REFERENCES

- Banase, R., Seise, J., & Zerbes, N. (2001). Implicit attitudes towards homosexuality: Reliability, validity, and controllability of the IAT. *Zeitschrift für experimentelle Psychologie*, 48(2), 145-160.
- Bastian, B., & Haslam, N. (2011). Experiencing dehumanization: Cognitive and emotional effects of everyday dehumanization. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 33(4), 295-303.
- Bastian, B., Laham, S. M., Wilson, S., Haslam, N., & Koval, P. (2011). Blaming, praising, and protecting our humanity: The implications of everyday dehumanization for judgments of moral status. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 50(3), 469-483.
- Bernard, P., Gervais, S., Allen, J., Campomizzi, S., & Klein, O. (2012). Integrating sexual objectification with object versus person recognition: The sexualized body-inversion hypothesis. *Psychological Science*, 23(5), 469-71.
- Blair, I. V., Ma, J. E., & Lenton, A. P. (2001). Imagining stereotypes away: the moderation of implicit stereotypes through mental imagery. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(5), 828.
- Blanton, H., Jaccard, J., Gonzales, P. M., & Christie, C. (2006). Decoding the implicit association test: Implications for criterion prediction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 42(2), 192-212.
- Blanton, H., Jaccard, J., Christie, C., & Gonzales, P. M. (2007). Plausible assumptions, questionable assumptions and post hoc rationalizations: Will the real IAT, please stand up?. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43(3), 399-409.

- Brennan, W. (2005). Female objects of semantic dehumanization and violence.
- Brooks, D. E., & Hébert, L. P. (2006). Gender, race, and media representation. *Handbook of Gender and Communication*, 16, 297-317.
- Buchanan, N. T., & Ormerod, A. J. (2002). Racialized sexual harassment in the lives of African American women. *Women & Therapy*, 25(3-4), 107-124.
- Calogero, R. M. (2004). A test of objectification theory: The effect of the male gaze on appearance concerns in college women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 28(1), 16-21.
doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2004.00118.x
- Calogero, R. M., Pina, A., Park, L. E., & Rahemtulla, Z. (2010). Objectification theory predicts college women's attitudes toward cosmetic surgery. *Sex Roles*, 63(1-2), 32-41.
- Cikara, M., Eberhardt, J. L., & Fiske, S. T. (2011). From agents to objects: Sexist attitudes and neural responses to sexualized targets. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 23(3), 540-551.
- Crandall, C. S., Ferguson, M. A., & Bahns, A. J. (2013). When we see prejudice: The normative window and social change. In C. Stangor & C. S. Crandall (Eds.), *Stereotyping and prejudice* (pp. 53-70). New York: Psychology Press.
- Cureton, E.E. (1951). Validity. In E.F. Lindquist (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (621 – 694). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Cunningham, W. A., Preacher, K. J., & Banaji, M. R. (2001). Implicit attitude measures: Consistency, stability, and convergent validity. *Psychological science*, 12(2), 163-170.
- DeLuca-McLean, D., & Castano, E. (2009). Infra-humanization of ethnic minorities: The moderating role of ideology. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 31(2), 102-108.

- Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., & Gaertner, S. L. (2002). Implicit and explicit prejudice and interracial interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(1), 62.
- Dworkin, A. (1994). Pornography happens to women. In a conference titled Speech, Equality and Harm: feminist Legal Perspectives on Pornography and Hate Propaganda. Chicago: March (Vol. 6, p. 1993).
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, 41, 1149-1160.
- Fazio, R. H., & Olson, M. A. (2003). Implicit measures in social cognition research: Their meaning and use. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54(1), 297-327.
- Fiedler, K., Messner, C., & Bluemke, M. (2006). Unresolved problems with the “I”, the “A”, and the “T”: A logical and psychometric critique of the Implicit Association Test (IAT). *European Review of Social Psychology*, 17(1), 74-147.
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 82(6), 878.
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J., & Glick, P. (2007). Universal dimensions of social cognition: Warmth and competence. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 11(2), 77-83
- Fiske, S. T. (2009). From dehumanization and objectification to rehumanization. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 116731-34. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.04544.x
- Fredrickson, B. L., & Roberts, T. A. (1997). Objectification theory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21(2), 173-206.

- Gawronski, B. (2002). What does the Implicit Association Test measure? A test of the convergent and discriminant validity of prejudice-related IATs. *Experimental Psychology (formerly Zeitschrift für Experimentelle Psychologie)*, 49(3), 171-180.
- Gervais, S. S., Holland, A. M., & Dodd, M. D. (2013). My Eyes Are Up Here: The Nature of the Objectifying Gaze Toward Women. *Sex Roles*, 69(11/12), 557-570. doi:10.1007/s11199-013-0316-x
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 491.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. (1997). Hostile and benevolent sexism: Measuring ambivalent sexist attitudes towards women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21(1), 119-135.
- Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J. L., Abrams, D., Masser, B., Adetoun, B., Osagie, J.E., Akande, A., Alao, A., Brunner, A., Willemsen, T.M., Chipeta, K., Dardenne, B., Dijksterhuis, A., Wigboldus, D., Eckes, T., Six-Materna, I., Exposito, F., Moya, M., Foddy, M., Kim, H.J., Lameiras, M., Sotelo, M.J., Mucchi-Faina, A., Romani, M., Sakal, N., Udegbe, B., Yamamoto, M., Ui, M., Ferreira, M.C, & López, W. L. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(5), 763.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist*, 56(2), 109.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2011). Ambivalent sexism revisited. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 35(3), 530-535.

- Goff, P., Eberhardt, J., Williams, M., & Jackson, M. (2008). Not yet human: Implicit knowledge, historical dehumanization, and contemporary consequences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(2), 292-306.
- Graff, K., Murnen, S. K., & Smolak, L. (2012). Too sexualized to be taken seriously? Perceptions of a girl in childlike vs. sexualizing clothing. *Sex roles*, 66(11-12), 764-775.
- Gray, H. M., Gray, K., & Wegner, D. M. (2007). Dimensions of mind perception. *Science*, 315(5812), 619-619.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, 102(1), 4.
- Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: the implicit association test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6), 1464.
- Greenwald, A. G., Banaji, M. R., Rudman, L. A., Farnham, S. D., Nosek, B. A., & Mellott, D. S. (2002). A unified theory of implicit attitudes, stereotypes, self-esteem, and self-concept. *Psychological Review*, 109(1), 3.
- Greenwald, A. G., Nosek, B. A., & Banaji, M. R. (2003). Understanding and using the implicit association test: I. An improved scoring algorithm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 197-216.
- Groos, A. (1991). Madame Butterfly: The story. *Cambridge Opera Journal*, 3(02), 125-158.
- Harris, L. T., & Fiske, S. T. (2006). Dehumanizing the lowest of the low neuroimaging responses to extreme out-groups. *Psychological science*, 17(10), 847-853.

- Haslam, N., Bain, P., Douge, L., Lee, M., & Bastian, B. (2005). More human than you: attributing humanness to self and others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89(6), 937.
- Haslam, N. T. (2006). Dehumanization: An integrative review. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 10, 252-264.
- Haslam, N., Kashima, Y., Loughnan, S., Shi, J., & Suitner, C. (2008). Subhuman, inhuman, and superhuman: Contrasting humans with nonhumans in three cultures. *Social Cognition*, 26(2), 248-258.
- Heflick, N. A., & Goldenberg, J. L. (2009). Objectifying Sarah Palin: Evidence that objectification causes women to be perceived as less competent and less fully human. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(3), 598-601.
- Hernandez, D. (2011). The effects of consuming pornography: Men's attitudes toward violence against women, dominance over and objectification of women, and sexual expectations of women. *Perspectives (University Of New Hampshire)*, 116-123.
- Hobson, J. (2003). The “batty” politic: Toward an aesthetic of the black female body. *Hypatia*, 18(4), 87-105.
- Jackson, S.L. (2014). Research methods and statistics: A critical thinking approach (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Killing us softly 4 [Motion picture]. (2010). United States: Cambridge Documentaries.
<http://www.mediaed.org/cgi-bin/commerce.cgi?preadd=action&key=241>
- Lee, S. J., & Vaught, S. (2003). "You can never be too rich or too thin": Popular and consumer culture and the Americanization of Asian American girls and young women. *Journal of Negro Education*, 72(4), 457.

- Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of psychology*.
- Loughnan, S., & Haslam, N. (2007). Animals and androids: Implicit associations between social categories and nonhumans. *Psychological Science*, 18(2), 116-121.
- Loughnan, S., Haslam, N., Murnane, T., Vaes, J., Reynolds, C., & Suitner, C. (2010). Objectification leads to depersonalization: The denial of mind and moral concern to objectified others. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 40(5), 709-717.
- Loughnan, S., Pina, A., Vasquez, E. A., & Puvia, E. (2013). Sexual objectification increases rape victim blame and decreases perceived suffering. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 37(4), 455-461.
- Macrae, C. N., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2001). Social cognition: Categorical person perception. *British Journal of Psychology*, 92(1), 239-255.
- Mayo, T.L. (2010). Black women and contemporary media: The struggle to self-define black womanhood. Master's thesis, Indiana University, Indianapolis, Indiana.
- McCabe, J. (2009). Racial and gender microaggressions on a predominantly-white campus: Experiences of Black, Latina/o and White undergraduates. *Race, Gender, & Class*, 16(1), 133-151. Retrieved December 30, 2014, from www.jstor.org
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1985). Updating Norman's "adequate taxonomy": Intelligence and personality dimensions in natural language and in questionnaires. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 710-721.
- Meade, A. W. (2009). FreeIAT: An open-source program to administer the implicit association test. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 33, 643.

- Mercurio, A., & Landry, L. (2008). Self-objectification and well-being: The impact of self-objectification on women's overall sense of self-worth and life satisfaction. *Sex Roles*, 58(7/8), 458-466. doi:10.1007/s11199-007-9357-3
- Moradi, B., & Huang, Y. (2008). Objectification theory and psychology of women: a decade of advances and future directions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 32(4), 377-398
- Mulac, A., Jansma, L., & Linz, D. (2002). Men's behavior toward women after viewing sexually-explicit films: Degradation makes a difference. *Communication Monographs*, 69(4), 311-328.
- Mura, D. (2005). Asia and Japanese Americans in the postwar era: The White gaze and the silenced sexual subject. *American Literary History*, 17(3), 604-620.
doi:10.1093/alh/aji035
- Nosek, B. A., Hawkins, C. B., & Frazier, R. S. (2011). Implicit social cognition: From measures to mechanisms. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 15(4), 152-159.
- Park, P. (2014). The Madame Butterfly effect. *Bitch Magazine: Feminist Response to Pop Culture*, (64), 28-33.
- Pilgrim, D. (2002). The Jezebel Stereotype. Ferris State University.
- Railton, D., & Watson, P. (2005). Naughty girls and red blooded women: Representations of female heterosexuality in music video. *Feminist Media Studies*, 5(1), 51-63.
- Rudman, L., & Mescher, K. (2012). Of animals and objects: Men's implicit dehumanization of women and likelihood of sexual aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 734-746.
















- Saguy, T., Quinn, D. M., Dovidio, J. F., & Pratto, F. (2010). Interacting like a body objectification can lead women to narrow their presence in social interactions. *Psychological Science*.
- Salzman, M. B. (2012). Dehumanization as a prerequisite of atrocity and killing. *Nonkilling Psychology*, 107.
- Sherman, G. D., & Haidt, J. (2011). Cuteness and disgust: The humanizing and dehumanizing effects of emotion. *Emotion Review*, 3(3), 245-251.
- Stankiewicz, J. M., & Rosselli, F. (2008). Women as sex objects and victims in print advertisements. *Sex Roles*, 58(7-8), 579-589.
- Stephens, D. P., & Phillips, L. D. (2003). Freaks, gold diggers, divas, and dykes: The sociohistorical development of adolescent African American women's sexual scripts. *Sexuality and Culture*, 7(1), 3-49.
- Sue, D. W., Bucceri, J., Lin, A. I., Nadal, K. L., & Torino, G. C. (2009). Racial microaggressions and the Asian American experience.
- Swim, J. K., Hyers, L. L., Cohen, L. L., & Ferguson, M. J. (2001). Everyday sexism: Evidence for its incidence, nature, and psychological impact from three daily diary studies. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(1), 31-53.
- Thorndike, E.L. (1918). The nature, purposes and general methods of measurements of educational products. *National Society for the Study of Educational Products: Seventeenth Yearbook*, 16 – 24. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Uchida, A. (1998). The orientalization of Asian women in America. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 21(2), 161-174. Retrieved December 29, 2014.

- Vaes, J., Paladino, P., & Puvia, E. (2011). Are sexualized women complete human beings? Why men and women dehumanize sexually objectified women. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 41*(6), 774-785. doi:10.1002/ejsp.824
- Waytz, A., Gray, K., Epley, N., & Wegner, D. M. (2010). Causes and consequences of mind perception. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 14*(8), 383-388.
- Weingartner, J. J. (1992). Trophies of war: US troops and the mutilation of Japanese war dead, 1941-1945. *The Pacific Historical Review, 53*-67.
- Wilson, T. D., Lindsey, S., & Schooler, T. Y. (2000). A model of dual attitudes. *Psychological Review, 107*(1), 101.
- Zurbriggen, E. L., Collins, R. L., Lamb, S., Roberts, T. A., Tolman, D. L., Ward, L. M., & Blake, J. (2007). Report of the APA Task Force on the sexualization of girls. American Psychological Association: Washington, DC Available online at <http://www.apa.org/pi/wpo/sexualizationrep.pdf>.

APPENDICES

Pretested Images (Appendix A)

	Black	White	Asian
Beauty-Based			
			
			
Sex-Based			

			
			
Neutral			
			
			

Pre-Test Questions (Appendix B)

1. How attractive is this woman?

Not at All	A Little Bit	Somewhat	Very Much	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5

2. How much do you think this woman is valued for her beauty?

Not at All	A Little Bit	Somewhat	Very Much	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5

3. How sexual do you think this woman is?

Not at All	A Little Bit	Somewhat	Very Much	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5

4. How much do you think this woman is valued for her sexuality?

Not at All	A Little Bit	Somewhat	Very Much	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5

5. How personable do you think this woman is?

Not at All	A Little Bit	Somewhat	Very Much	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5

6. How much do you think this woman is valued for who she is as a person?

Not at All	A Little Bit	Somewhat	Very Much	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5

The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Appendix C)

Below is a series of statements concerning men and women and their relationships in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the following scale: 0 = disagree strongly; 1 = disagree somewhat; 2 = disagree slightly; 3 = agree slightly; 4 = agree somewhat; 5 = agree strongly.

- _____ 1. No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.
- _____ 2. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for "equality."
- _____ 3. In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men.
- _____ 4. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.
- _____ 5. Women are too easily offended.
- _____ 6. People are often truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex.
- _____ 7. Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men.
- _____ 8. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.
- _____ 9. Women should be cherished and protected by men.
- _____ 10. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.
- _____ 11. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.
- _____ 12. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.
- _____ 13. Men are complete without women.
- _____ 14. Women exaggerate problems they have at work.
- _____ 15. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.
- _____ 16. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.
- _____ 17. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.

_____ 18. There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.

_____ 19. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.

_____ 20. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.

_____ 21. Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men.

_____ 22. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.

Dehumanization Scales (Appendix D)

Below is a list of words concerning the personality of the individual in the picture. Please indicate the degree to which you believe each word describes the person in the picture using the following scale: 1 = disagree strongly; 2 = disagree slightly; 3 = neutral; 4 = agree slightly; 5 = agree strongly.

1. _____ Ambitious (UH)
2. _____ Analytic (UH)
3. _____ Imaginative (UH)
4. _____ Sympathetic (UH)
5. _____ Broad-minded (UH)
6. _____ Humble (UH)
7. _____ Polite (UH)
8. _____ Thorough (UH)
9. _____ Active (HN)
10. _____ Curious (HN)
11. _____ Friendly (HN)
12. _____ Fun-loving (HN)
13. _____ Contented (HN)
14. _____ Even-tempered (HN)
15. _____ Relaxed (HN)
16. _____ Selfless (HN)
17. _____ High-strung (UH)
18. _____ Insecure (UH)
19. _____ Irresponsible (UH)
20. _____ Reserved (UH)
21. _____ Disorganized (UH)
22. _____ Ignorant (UH)
23. _____ Rude (UH)
24. _____ Stingy (UH)
25. _____ Impatient (HN)
26. _____ Impulsive (HN)
27. _____ Jealous (HN)
28. _____ Shy (HN)
29. _____ Simple (HN)
30. _____ Timid (HN)
31. _____ Uncooperative (HN)
32. _____ Unemotional (HN)

Demographics (Appendix E)

What is your age? _____

What is your gender? _____

What is/are your race and/or your ethnicity? _____

What is your sexual orientation? _____

Tables (Appendix F)

Table 1		
<i>Pretest Scales Reliability Coefficients</i>		
Race-Appearance	No. of items	Cronbach's α Coefficient (no. of responses)
White-Beauty	6	0.66 (96)
White-Neutral	6	0.76 (96)
White-Sexual	6	0.55 (96)
Black-Beauty	6	0.75 (96)
Black-Neutral	6	0.71 (96)
Black-Sexual	6	0.57 (96)
Asian-Beauty	6	0.75 (96)
Asian-Neutral	6	0.73 (96)
Asian-Sexual	6	0.541 (96)
Reliability coefficient internally reliable ≥ 0.7		

Table 2						
<i>Pretest Image Means and Standard Deviations</i>						
	Attractiveness	Beauty Value	Sexuality	Sexual Value	Personhood	Person Value
White-Beauty	3.68 (.77)	3.87 (.55)	3.22 (.58)	3.33 (.72)	2.94 (.75)	2.89 (.77)
White-Neutral	3.03 (.89)	3.17 (.70)	2.39 (.68)	2.54 (.77)	3.78 (.74)	3.71 (.75)
White-Sexual	3.07 (1.06)	3.87 (.89)	4.03 (.79)	4.00 (.80)	2.50 (1.02)	2.23 (.90)
Black-Beauty	3.75 (.85)	3.75 (.71)	2.78 (.67)	2.96 (.80)	3.32 (.81)	3.36 (.75)
Black-Neutral	3.64 (.74)	3.56 (.65)	2.58 (.81)	2.70 (.81)	3.83 (.78)	3.74 (.71)
Black-Sexual	3.94 (.76)	4.20 (.72)	4.01 (.70)	4.17 (.71)	2.82 (1.00)	2.47 (.93)
Asian-Beauty	3.27 (.88)	3.44 (.80)	2.45 (.68)	2.69 (.79)	3.11 (.87)	3.19 (.75)
Asian-Neutral	3.14 (.84)	2.97 (.75)	2.16 (.84)	2.21 (.86)	3.90 (.81)	3.79 (.79)
Asian-Sexual	3.23 (.91)	3.73 (.77)	3.73 (.70)	3.76 (.76)	2.58 (.91)	2.41 (.83)
N=96						

Table 3		
<i>IAT Reliability Coefficients</i>		
IAT Comparison	No. of trials per block	Cronbach's α Coefficient (no. of responses)
White-Asian (Beauty)	6	-.12 (49)
White-Black (Beauty)	6	.39 (49)
White-Asian (Neutral)	6	.23 (49)
White-Black (Neutral)	6	.06 (49)
White-Asian (Sexual)	6	.16 (49)
White-Black (Sexual)	6	.37 (49)
Reliability coefficient internally reliable ≥ 0.7		

Table 4		
<i>Dehumanization Scales Reliability Coefficients</i>		
Race-Appearance	No. of items (across image type)	Cronbach's α Coefficient (no. of responses)
White-Beauty	48	0.87 (47)
White-Neutral	48	0.90 (47)
White-Sexual	48	0.88 (47)
Black-Beauty	48	0.81 (47)
Black-Neutral	48	0.86 (47)
Black-Sexual	48	0.85 (47)
Asian-Beauty	48	0.82 (47)
Asian-Neutral	48	0.91 (47)
Asian-Sexual	48	0.80 (47)
Reliability coefficient internally reliable ≥ 0.7		